

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application as amended. Claims 1-18 and 20-24 have been amended. No claims have been cancelled. No new claims have been added. Therefore, claims 1-24 are now are presented for examination. The following remarks are in response to the final Office Action mailed on June 27, 2005.

### 35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over Anand et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,810,478 (“Anand”), in view of Slivka et al., U.S. Patent 6,256,668 (“Slivka”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Anand discloses “[a] chained bootstrap that is identified on a Boot Image Negotiation Layer (BINL) server and which is specified as the default bootstrap for *the remote booting of client machines without regard to what client OS will finally be booted.*” (Abstract; emphasis provided). Anand further discloses “a *method to remote boot multiple operating systems* without having to reconfigure the BINL server for each change in a client operating system would be desirable.” (col. 2, lines 34-36; emphasis provided).

Slivka discloses a method in which “the user is asked to choose which available computer software shown in the output report, if any, will be downloaded and installed on the user computer.” (col. 8, lines 42-46).

In contrast, claim 1, in pertinent part, as amended, recites “upon a selection of the operating system, instructing the device through the network to install the operating system.” (emphasis provided). Anand discloses “*the remote booting of client machines*

*without regard to what client OS will finally be booted*” (Abstract; emphasis provided); however, Anandu fails to teach or reasonably suggest “instructing the device through the network to install the operating system” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). Remotely booting an operation system as in Anandu is not the same as “instructing the device through the network to install the operating system” as recited by claim 1. (emphasis provided). In addition, Slivka does not teach or reasonably suggest “upon a selection of the operating system, instructing the device through the network to install the operating system.” (emphasis provided). Applicants respectfully submit that neither Anand nor Slivka, individually or combined, teach or reasonably suggest “upon a selection of the operating system, instructing the device through the network to install the operating system.” (emphasis provided). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection to claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claims 5, 8, 12, 15 and 22 contain limitations similar to those of claims 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 5, 8, 12, 15 and 22 and their dependent claims.

### **Conclusion**

In light of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of the claims is hereby earnestly requested.

### **Invitation for a Telephone Interview**

The Examiner is requested to call the undersigned at (303) 740-1980 if there remains any issue with allowance of the case.

### **Request for an Extension of Time**

Applicants respectfully petition for an extension of time to respond to the outstanding Office Action pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a) should one be necessary. Please charge our Deposit Account No. 02-2666 to cover the necessary fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a) for such an extension.


### **Charge our Deposit Account**

Please charge any shortage to our Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: September 27, 2005

  
Aslam A. Jaffery  
Reg. No. 51,841

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
7<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90025-1030  
(303) 740-1980